

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/581,535	Applicant(s) STEUNENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner BHARAT C. PATEL	Art Unit 3724	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowance

(1) BHARAT C. PATEL.

(3) Gregory L. Thorne.

(2) Ghassem Alie.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 6 May 2010

Time: 1 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Previous non-final rejection with respect to 112th second para, and the amendment.

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Hawes (2006/0037197) and Schmitz (6138364)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The submitted amendment does not overcome the 112th second para rejection, and can be read on the Schmitz. Applicant authorized Examiner's amendment to amend the claim 1 so that the amendment overcomes the rejection of the prior art of the record. The proposal was discussed to clarify the mounting method of the cutting member.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)